

### Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

#### **Claim Status**

Claims 1-21 were presented and remain pending. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 20 and 21 are amended.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The allowance of claims 8-15, 20 and 21, and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-7 and 17-19, is noted and appreciated. Minor amendments are made to claims 2, 6, 8, 10 and 20 to more clearly specify the power *supply* voltage. In claim 21, --to-- has been inserted after "according" as suggested by the Action:

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102(b)**

Claims 1 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Miyakawa et al. (US 6,088,281). For the reasons discussed below, applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and asserts that claims 1 and 16 distinguish over and are not anticipated by Miyakawa.

Claim 1 recites "at least one pad to which a control signal is supplied" and "a read control circuit connected to the...at least one pad". In this manner, as also recited in claim 1, the timing at which an operation of reading the fuse data is to be activated can be controlled based on a control signal supplied to the pad. This is illustrated and described throughout the specification, for example, wherein based on control signals CADD0, CADD1 provided to pads P0, P1, the timing at which read control circuit 19 causes fuse data stored in ROM region 11b to be read is controlled.

In Miyakawa, conversely, after power-on (PON) and pre-charge (PCHG) signals are applied, a latch trigger circuit 36 outputs read trigger (RSTART) and readout control (READ) signals, and the fuse data is read out. See, for example, Miyakawa's Figure 3 which is a timing diagram showing this sequence of events. Although the Action asserts that "any node" of Miyakawa's Figure 2 corresponds to

applicant's recited "at least one pad to which a control signal is applied", there is no node in Miyakawa which receives control signals and, based on those control signals, controls the timing at which a read control circuit causes fuse data to be read. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Miyakawa that the timing at which fuse data is read out is anything but constant; thus, the timing is not controlled based on control signals applied to pads connected to a read control circuit, as is required by claim 1.

Since Miyakawa does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, it cannot anticipate claim 1. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Similarly, claim 16 recites a delay circuit connected to a ROM read control circuit. Based on second signals supplied to a second pad connected to the delay circuit, the ROM read control circuit controls reading of the fuse data from the ROM region. Again, in Miyakawa, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the timing at which the signals RSTART, etc. are output is anything but constant, and hence, Miyakawa does not disclose a delay circuit that controls the timing of the read out of fuse data based on second signals applied to second pads.

The Action references Figure 2 and asserts that Miyakawa's fuse latch trigger circuit 36 has a delay time that is controlled based on signal FLST. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As discussed in column 6, lines 5-13, fuse latch trigger circuit operates *upon reception* of signal FLST from verify circuit 35 to supply signals PCHG, RSTART and READ to fuse control circuits 321-324. There is no disclosure or suggestion that a delay time of circuit 36 is set based on signal FLST. Rather, it appears that circuit 36 immediately outputs its signals without delay after reception of signal FLST.

Since Miyakawa does not disclose each and every element of claim 16, it cannot anticipate claim 16. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/648,853  
Amdt. dated June 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of March 8, 2005

Atty. Ref. 81790.0294  
Customer No. 26021

### Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss any issues that remain after entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: June 8, 2005

By: 

Troy M. Schmelzer  
Registration No. 36,667  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701